

J U N E 2 0 0 3

REPORT TO THE CONGRESS

Variation and Innovation  
in Medicare

Defendants' Exhibit

1110

01-12257 - PBS

**MEDPAC** Medicare  
Payment Advisory  
Commission



# MEDPAC

Medicare  
Payment Advisory  
Commission

The Medicare Payment Advisory Commission (MedPAC) is an independent federal body established by the Balanced Budget Act of 1997 (P.L. 105-33) to advise the U.S. Congress on issues affecting the Medicare program. In addition to advising the Congress on payments to health plans participating in the Medicare+Choice program and providers in Medicare's traditional fee-for-service program, MedPAC is also tasked with analyzing access to care, quality of care, and other issues affecting Medicare.

The Commission's 17 members bring diverse expertise in the financing and delivery of health care services. Commissioners are appointed to three-year terms (subject to renewal) by the Comptroller General and serve part time. Appointments are staggered; the terms of five or six Commissioners expire each year. The Commission is supported by an executive director and a staff of analysts, who typically have backgrounds in economics, health policy, and public health.

MedPAC meets publicly to discuss policy issues and formulate its recommendations to the Congress. In the course of these meetings, Commissioners consider the results of staff research, presentations by policy experts, and comments from interested parties. (Meeting transcripts are available at [www.medpac.gov](http://www.medpac.gov).) Commission members and staff also seek input on Medicare issues through frequent meetings with individuals interested in the program, including staff from congressional committees and the Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services (CMS), health care researchers, health care providers, and beneficiary advocates.

Two reports—issued in March and June each year—are the primary outlet for Commission recommendations. This report describes variations in Medicare and innovations in purchasing for the program. Annual reports each March focus on payment policy. In addition to annual reports and occasional reports on subjects requested by the Congress, MedPAC advises the Congress through other avenues, including comments on reports and proposed regulations issued by the Secretary of the Department of Health and Human Services, testimony, and briefings for congressional staff.

J U N E 2 0 0 3

**REPORT TO THE CONGRESS**

**Variation and Innovation  
in Medicare**

**MEDPAC** Medicare  
Payment Advisory  
Commission

601 New Jersey Avenue, NW • Suite 9000 • Washington, DC 20001  
(202) 220-3700 • Fax: (202) 220-3759 • [www.medpac.gov](http://www.medpac.gov)



601 New Jersey Avenue, NW • Suite 9000  
Washington, DC 20001  
202-220-3700 • Fax: 202-220-3759  
www.medpac.gov

Glenn M. Hackbarth, J.D., Chairman  
Robert D. Reischauer, Ph.D., Vice Chairman  
Mark E. Miller, Ph.D., Executive Director

June 12, 2003

The Honorable Richard B. Cheney  
President of the Senate  
U.S. Capitol  
Washington, DC 20510

Dear Mr. Vice President:

I am pleased to submit a copy of the Medicare Payment Advisory Commission's June 2003 Report to the Congress: Variation and Innovation in Medicare. This report fulfills MedPAC's legislative mandate to examine issues affecting the Medicare program, including the implications of changes in health care delivery for the Medicare program.

This report examines variation within expenditures, patterns of care, performance, and supplemental insurance, as well as several possible payment innovations.

- The first two chapters of this report look at variation in Medicare spending across the country and at the differing insurance markets for products that supplement Medicare.
- The next four chapters examine variation within major classes of providers, including hospitals, physicians, post-acute care providers, and dialysis facilities.
- The last three chapters investigate, and in some cases offer recommendations for, approaches Medicare could take to purchase more effectively. Ideas discussed include incentives to improve quality, competitive pricing, and alternative methods of paying for Medicare-covered drugs.
- The report includes two appendixes. One fulfills our statutory obligation to analyze the Secretary of HHS's estimate of the update for physician services. The other lays out a new feature of the June report—an agenda for improving data on Medicare and health care.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Glenn M. Hackbarth".

Glenn Hackbarth, J.D.  
Chairman

Enclosure



601 New Jersey Avenue, NW • Suite 9000  
Washington, DC 20001  
202-220-3700 • Fax: 202-220-3759  
[www.medpac.gov](http://www.medpac.gov)

Glenn M. Hackbarth, J.D., Chairman  
Robert D. Reischauer, Ph.D., Vice Chairman  
Mark E. Miller, Ph.D., Executive Director

June 12, 2003

The Honorable J. Dennis Hastert  
Speaker of the House of Representatives  
U.S. House of Representatives  
H232 Capitol Building  
Washington, DC 20515

Dear Mr. Speaker:

I am pleased to submit a copy of the Medicare Payment Advisory Commission's June 2003 Report to the Congress: Variation and Innovation in Medicare. This report fulfills MedPAC's legislative mandate to examine issues affecting the Medicare program, including the implications of changes in health care delivery for the Medicare program.

This report examines variation within expenditures, patterns of care, performance, and supplemental insurance, as well as several possible payment innovations.

- The first two chapters of this report look at variation in Medicare spending across the country and at the differing insurance markets for products that supplement Medicare.
- The next four chapters examine variation within major classes of providers, including hospitals, physicians, post-acute care providers, and dialysis facilities.
- The last three chapters investigate, and in some cases offer recommendations for, approaches Medicare could take to purchase more effectively. Ideas discussed include incentives to improve quality, competitive pricing, and alternative methods of paying for Medicare-covered drugs.
- The report includes two appendixes. One fulfills our statutory obligation to analyze the Secretary of HHS's estimate of the update for physician services. The other lays out a new feature of the June report—an agenda for improving data on Medicare and health care.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "G. M. Hackbarth".

Glenn Hackbarth, J.D.  
Chairman

Enclosure

## Acknowledgments

---

This report was prepared with the assistance of many people. Their support was key as the Commission considered policy issues and worked toward consensus on its recommendations. We thank the staff members of the Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services who, despite a heavy workload, were particularly helpful during preparation of the report: Sharon Arnold, Brady Augustine, Jody Blatt, Phillip Cotterill, William Cymer, Rick Foster, Pamela Frederick, Mark Freeland, Stuart Guterman, Marc Hartstein, Stephen Heffler, Peter Hickman, Linda Magno, Ann Meadow, Solomon Mussey, Kimberly Neuman, Robert Niemann, Barbara Paul, Sharnan Stephens, Mark Wynn, Scott Young, and Carlos Zarabozo.

The Commission also received valuable insights and assistance from others—in government, industry, and the research community—who generously offered their time and knowledge: Rich Averill, Bob Berenson, Don Berwick, Camela Bocchino, Deborah Chollet, Janet Corrigan, Kathleen Dalton, Suzanne Delbanco, Laura Dummit, Zach Dyckman, Nancy Edwards, Carlos Figueiredo, Elliott Fisher, Karen Fisher, Nancy Foster, Jane Galvin, Daniel Gaylin, Isadora Gil, Michael Gluck, Norbert Goldfield, Russ Hereford, Jack Hoadley, Chris Hogan, Mark Holmes, Brent James, Lisa Joyner, Ed Kalman, Kathryn Linehan, Korbin Liu, Joanne Lynn, Barbara Manard, Maria Martino, Sharon McIlrath, Adil Moiduddin, Gordon Mosser, Kevin Piper, Robert Rubin, Mary Beth Senkewicz, Kathleen Smith, Gerri Smolka, Bruce Steinwald, Sarah Townsend, Brad Travers, Sally Trude, Margaret VanAmringe, Andy Webber, and Robert Wolfe.

Chapter 7, on using incentives to improve the quality of care in Medicare, would not have been possible without the contributions of many private sector purchaser and plan representatives. The lessons the Commission learned from these many and varied initiatives were critical for developing guidance for the Medicare program. We thank the individuals we interviewed: Stuart Baker, Deborah Loeb Bohren, Bruce Bradley, Beau Carter, Becky Cherney, Jack Cox, Helen Darling, Francois de Brantes, Sam Fleming, Roberta Herman, Sam Ho, Herb Kuhn, Peter Lee, Janet Marchibroda, Woody Myers, Sam Nussbaum, Carolyn Pare, Sue Peters, Sam Schmitts, Patricia Smith, and Bob Stone.

Once again, the programmers at Social and Scientific Systems provided highly capable assistance to the Commission staff. In particular, we appreciate the hard work of Valerie Aschenbach, Daksha Danera, Deborah Johnson, Carl Newman, and Arlene Turner.

Finally, the Commission wishes to thank Mimi Cantwell, Cynthia Pratt, and Rebecca Weber for their help editing and producing this report. ■

## Table of contents

---

<b>Acknowledgments</b> .....	<b>v</b>
<b>Tables</b> .....	<b>ix</b>
<b>Figures</b> .....	<b>xi</b>
<b>Executive summary</b> .....	<b>xv</b>
<b>Chapters</b>	
<b>1 Geographic variation in per beneficiary Medicare expenditures</b> .....	<b>3</b>
Background .....	4
Measurement of variation .....	4
Sources of variation .....	4
Analysis of total variation .....	6
Does variation in adjusted service use imply inequity? .....	8
Factors affecting variation in smaller geographic areas .....	10
Conclusions .....	13
<b>2 Market variation: implications for beneficiaries and policy reform</b> .....	<b>19</b>
Insurance markets and supplemental benefits .....	21
Overview of Medicare insurance markets in states and metropolitan areas .....	31
Conclusions and key policy questions for future work .....	35
<b>3 Accounting for variation in hospital financial performance under prospective payment</b> .....	<b>41</b>
Summary of findings .....	43
Modeling sources of variation in hospitals' Medicare inpatient PPS margins .....	43
Findings .....	47
Study limitations .....	55
Discussion and policy implications .....	55
<b>4 Growth and variation in use of physician services</b> .....	<b>61</b>
Trends in use of physician services .....	62
Geographic variation in use of physician services .....	64
Interpreting the data .....	65
Next steps .....	66
<b>5 Monitoring post-acute care</b> .....	<b>71</b>
Patterns of beneficiaries' use of post-acute care pre- and post-PPS .....	73
Comparing beneficiaries treated in long-term care hospitals and other settings .....	79



<b>6</b>	<b>Quality of dialysis care and providers' costs</b>	<b>91</b>
	Paying for outpatient dialysis services	94
	Assessing the relationship between quality and dialysis providers' costs	94
	Implications and next steps	98
<b>7</b>	<b>Using incentives to improve the quality of care in Medicare</b>	<b>107</b>
	How incentives relate to improving health care quality	109
	Private sector use of incentives	111
	Applying incentives to improve quality in Medicare	113
	Examples of private sector efforts to use incentives to improve quality	122
<b>8</b>	<b>Using market competition in fee-for-service Medicare</b>	<b>131</b>
	Key design issues	132
	Two competitive pricing demonstrations	134
	Building upon demonstration experience	141
<b>9</b>	<b>Medicare payments for outpatient drugs under Part B</b>	<b>149</b>
	Coverage and spending	150
	Issues raised by the current payment system	155
	Reform efforts	159
	Lessons from other payers	164
<b>Appendixes</b>		
<b>A</b>	<b>Review of CMS's estimate of the payment update for physician services</b>	<b>173</b>
<b>B</b>	<b>Agenda for improved data on Medicare and health care</b>	<b>179</b>
	Monitoring access	179
	Assessing quality of care	180
	Assessing costs of care	180
	Access to private payer information	182
<b>C</b>	<b>Commissioners' voting on recommendations</b>	<b>187</b>
<b>Acronyms</b>		<b>191</b>
<b>More about MedPAC</b>		
Commission members		197
Commissioners' biographies		199
Commission staff		205



## Tables

<b>1</b>	<b>Geographic variation in per beneficiary Medicare expenditures</b>	<b>3</b>
1-1	Effect of adjustments on variation in Medicare FFS expenditures by state, 2000	8
1-2	Summary statistics for variables explaining variation in adjusted service use, 2000	12
1-3	Using demographic data to explain variation in adjusted service use, 2000	13
1-4	Using demographic and health care market data to explain variation in adjusted service use, 2000	13
<b>2</b>	<b>Market variation: implications for beneficiaries and policy reform</b>	<b>19</b>
2-1	The playing field for Medicare supplementation	23
2-2	Medicare beneficiaries with employer-sponsored coverage, by state	31
2-3	Medicare beneficiaries with Medicaid coverage, by state	32
2-4	Medicare beneficiaries with Medigap coverage, by state	32
2-5	Percent of Medigap policies that include a prescription drug benefit (H, I, or J), by state	32
2-6	Medicare beneficiaries in Medicare managed care plans, by state	32
2-7	Medicare beneficiaries' supplementation, by urban and rural areas	33
2-8	Medicare beneficiaries' supplementation, selected metropolitan areas	34
2-9	Medicare beneficiaries' supplementation, by age and state Medigap mandates	35
2-10	State Medigap mandates	35
<b>3</b>	<b>Accounting for variation in hospital financial performance under prospective payment</b>	<b>41</b>
3-1	Hospitals included in analysis by cost reporting year	47
3-2	Variables included in models of Medicare hospital inpatient margins	49
3-3	Predicted payment-to-cost margins by location and type of ownership, for an otherwise identical base case facility, 1998	54
<b>4</b>	<b>Growth and variation in use of physician services</b>	<b>61</b>
4-1	Change in use of physician services per beneficiary in traditional Medicare, for selected services, 1999–2002	63
4-2	Geographic variation in use of physician services among the 50 largest metropolitan statistical areas, 1999–2002	65
<b>5</b>	<b>Monitoring post-acute care</b>	<b>71</b>
5-1	Changes in the spending for and duration of post-acute care episodes, 1996 and 2001	75
5-2	Changes in the per capita use of and spending for post-acute care, by states' 1996 level of spending	76

5-3	Hospital discharge destinations for selected DRGs, 1996 and 2001 .....	78
5-4	Comparing predicted use of and spending for community-referral home health to actual levels, 2001 .....	79
5-5	Comparison of patient characteristics by market areas, 2001 .....	83
5-6	Patients in five DRGs by selected levels of severity of illness, in market areas with and without LTCHs, 2001 .....	84
5-7	Total payments for patients who used post-acute care, by use of LTCHs, in market areas with LTCHs, 2001 .....	85
5-8	Death rates and rates of readmission for patients who used post-acute care, in market areas with LTCHs, 2001 .....	86
5-9	Characteristics of primary referrers to long-term care hospitals and nation's general hospitals, 2000 .....	87
<b>6</b>	<b>Quality of dialysis care and providers' costs .....</b>	<b>91</b>
6-1	Characteristics of freestanding dialysis facilities, by quartile of average cost per hemodialysis treatment, 2000 .....	92
6-2	Recent studies examining the impact of providers' characteristics on quality of dialysis care .....	93
6-3	Quality of dialysis care and beneficiaries' outcomes, by quartile of average cost per hemodialysis treatment, 2000 .....	98
6-4	Multivariate regression analysis of facility-level cost per treatment for composite rate services and beneficiaries' outcomes, 2000 .....	99
6-5	Multivariate regression analysis of facility-level cost per treatment for both composite rate services and injectable drugs and beneficiaries' outcomes, 2000 .....	100
<b>7</b>	<b>Using incentives to improve the quality of care in Medicare .....</b>	<b>107</b>
7-1	National summary of Medicare quality indicators .....	116
<b>8</b>	<b>Using market competition in fee-for-service Medicare .....</b>	<b>131</b>
8-1	Concentration of markets, by type of DME .....	144
<b>9</b>	<b>Medicare payments for outpatient drugs under Part B .....</b>	<b>149</b>
9-1	Top 20 drugs covered by Medicare Part B, by share of expenditures, 2001 .....	151
9-2	Health plans' pricing for physician-administered drugs, by AWP formula .....	167
<b>A</b>	<b>Review of CMS's estimate of the payment update for physician services .....</b>	<b>173</b>
A-1	Preliminary sustainable growth rate, 2004 .....	174
A-2	Estimate of the update for physician services, 2004 .....	174

## Figures

<b>1</b>	<b>Geographic variation in per beneficiary Medicare expenditures</b>	<b>3</b>
1-1	State-level per beneficiary FFS expenditures, weighted by number of beneficiaries, 2000	6
1-2	State-level per beneficiary FFS expenditures adjusted for input prices, weighted by number of beneficiaries, 2000	7
1-3	State-level per beneficiary FFS expenditures adjusted for input prices, health status, and special payments, weighted by number of beneficiaries, 2000	7
1-4	States' adjusted service use and quality of care, 2000	9
1-5	States' per beneficiary adjusted service use and per beneficiary cost sharing	9
1-6	Variation in county-level per beneficiary adjusted service use, weighted by number of beneficiaries (Iowa, 2000)	11
<b>2</b>	<b>Market variation: implications for beneficiaries and policy reform</b>	<b>19</b>
2-1	Composition of out-of-pocket spending, by type of supplemental insurance, 2000	21
<b>3</b>	<b>Accounting for variation in hospital financial performance under prospective payment</b>	<b>41</b>
3-1	Distribution of inpatient and overall Medicare margins, 1999	42
3-2	Differences in performance, by hospitals' eligibility for policy adjustments, fiscal year 1999	45
3-3	Conceptual framework for modeling PPS inpatient margins	46
3-4	Sample simulation for base case hospital: predicted effect of case-mix weights on payments, costs, and payment margins	50
3-5	Summary of margin effects for three PPS cost adjusters and three PPS policy adjusters	51
3-6	Summary of margin effects for other cost factors	53
<b>4</b>	<b>Growth and variation in use of physician services</b>	<b>61</b>
4-1	Average adjusted per beneficiary use of physician services, by quartile, 1999–2002	64
4-2	Average adjusted per beneficiary use of imaging services, by quartile, 1999–2002	65
<b>5</b>	<b>Monitoring post-acute care</b>	<b>71</b>
5-1	Time line of Medicare payment changes for post-acute care	72
5-2	Location of long-term care hospitals, 2002	81
5-3	Patients' use of post-acute care, by severity level, in market areas with and without LTCHs, 2001	86

<b>9</b>	<b>Medicare payments for outpatient drugs under Part B</b>	<b>149</b>
9-1	Medicare drug spending, by physician specialties and other providers, 2001	152
9-2	Medicare spending and annual growth rates for Part B drugs	154
9-3	Medicare payments vs. provider costs: an example for a generic drug	157
9-4	Medicare payments vs. provider costs: an example for a brand name drug	157
9-5	Medicaid drug reimbursement example	165
<b>A</b>	<b>Review of CMS's estimate of the payment update for physician services</b>	<b>173</b>
A-1	Target and actual spending for physician services, 1997–2003	174



CHAPTER

9

Medicare payments for  
outpatient drugs under Part B



## CHAPTER

## 9

## Medicare payments for outpatient drugs under Part B

### In this chapter

- Coverage and spending
- Issues raised by the current payment system
- Reform efforts
- Lessons from other payers

**T**his chapter looks in depth at one service—Medicare-covered outpatient drugs—for which the Medicare payment method is flawed. Three major problems are that Medicare payments far exceed provider acquisition costs; the system creates incentives for manufacturers to raise their list prices, resulting in increased Medicare payments; and drug administration fees do not reflect the true costs of providing drugs to beneficiaries.

Policymakers are considering how to change the current system. We examined payment methods that other public and private purchasers have developed for physician-administered drugs. We also analyzed the alternatives suggested by the policy community, which include benchmarking methods, payment based on invoice prices, and competitive bidding. Several variants of benchmarking methods are possible, including benchmarking payment amounts to transaction prices that could be audited. Combination approaches based on the competitiveness of the therapeutic drug class are also possible. While each method has advantages and disadvantages, any one of these alternatives would be a significant improvement over the current payment system.

Spending for outpatient drugs covered under Medicare Part B has grown rapidly. Preliminary estimates suggest that expenditures reached \$8.5 billion in 2002, an increase of nearly 35 percent over 2001 totals. For the past four years, expenditures have increased annually by more than 20 percent. This growth reflects increased use of the drugs, rising prices, and incremental coverage expansions. Medicare-covered outpatient drugs are mainly used in cancer treatment, dialysis, organ transplantation, and hemophilia. Medicare also covers some outpatient drugs used with durable medical equipment such as infusion pumps and nebulizers.

Medicare pays providers 95 percent of the average wholesale price (AWP) for each covered drug. Despite its name, AWP does not represent the average wholesale price but rather can be thought of as a manufacturer's suggested list price. AWP is not defined in law or regulation and does not have to correspond to any transaction price or average transaction price. A series of studies by the General Accounting Office (GAO) and the Department of Health and Human Services' (HHS) Office of Inspector General (OIG) showed that the current Medicare payment method leads to payments that far exceed providers' costs (GAO 2001b; OIG 2001, 1997, 1996). In some cases, beneficiaries' coinsurance payments alone exceed the price physicians and other providers paid for the drugs.

This chapter describes the current payment method and looks at the potential alternatives being considered by the policy community. We examine the mix of drugs covered by Medicare and analyze trends in spending and provide an overview of the legislative and regulatory history of the payment system, including recent administrative steps taken by CMS. We focus on three problems with the payment system: Medicare payments far

exceed provider acquisition costs; the system creates incentives for manufacturers to raise list prices; and high drug prices may, in part, subsidize drug administration fees, which may not reflect the true cost of providing drugs to beneficiaries.

We present some alternatives to reform the Medicare payment system, and analyze how they would affect Medicare payments for covered drugs, how likely they are to affect beneficiary access to needed therapies, what administrative costs they would entail, and how they might affect the operation of the wider pharmaceutical market. While all payment methods have advantages and disadvantages, each option analyzed would be a significant improvement over the current payment system. Most would eliminate manufacturer incentives to raise list prices. Finally, we examine payment methods developed by other public and private payers for physician-administered drugs. These methods provide additional insight into alternatives to the Medicare payment system.

## Coverage and spending

Medicare spending for Part B drugs has increased rapidly in recent years, growing by 26 percent in 2001 with corresponding increases in beneficiary obligations for copayments. Beneficiaries who receive these drugs are responsible for paying 20 percent coinsurance after they meet the annual Part B \$100 deductible. CMS projects that expenditures totaled \$8.5 billion in 2002, an increase of nearly 35 percent.<sup>1</sup> Increased spending is associated with recent coverage expansions. Spending for Part B drugs is highly concentrated. The top 35 drugs accounted for almost 90 percent of drug spending and three specialties—hematology oncology, medical oncology, and urology—accounted for more than half of total billing in 2001.

## Which drugs are covered?

In general, Medicare covers drugs administered in physician offices, used as part of durable medical equipment or infusion devices, as well as some oral drugs used following organ transplants. Of the top 20 drugs covered by Medicare in 2001, 7 received Food and Drug Administration (FDA) approval in 1996 or later.

## Drugs currently covered

Under Part B, Medicare covers about 450 outpatient pharmaceutical products and biologics. Spending is highly concentrated among these products. Thirty-five of the covered drugs account for 88 and 95 percent of Medicare drug spending and drug claims volume, respectively. The top 20 drugs covered under Part B are shown in Table 9-1. They accounted for about 77 percent of Part B drug expenditures; nonend-stage renal disease erythropoietin<sup>2</sup> alone accounted for more than 12 percent.

Not generally available through retail pharmacies, these drugs are provided by physicians in their offices or through pharmacy suppliers that provide drugs used with durable medical equipment. They include:

- drugs not self-administered and furnished incidental to a physician's service, such as prostate cancer drugs;
- certain cancer and anti-nausea drugs available in pill form;
- blood clotting factor;
- immunosuppressive drugs used following organ transplants;
- erythropoietin used to treat anemia in end-stage renal disease patients and cancer patients;
- drugs used as part of durable medical equipment or infusion devices like the albuterol used in nebulizers for asthma and other pulmonary diseases; and

<sup>1</sup> Expenditure totals for 2002 are still preliminary. These totals represent carrier paid drugs and do not include intermediary paid drugs including drugs dispensed in outpatient departments of hospitals and freestanding dialysis facilities (see text box, p. 155).

<sup>2</sup> The Congress established a separate payment rate for erythropoietin supplied to end-stage renal disease patients in dialysis facilities (see text box, p. 155).